

**REMARKS**

Applicant has canceled claims 39, 47 and 50, filed new claims 51-55, and amended claims 32, 38, 40-42, 46, and 48-49 to better encompass the full scope and breadth of the invention notwithstanding Applicant's belief that the claims would have been allowable as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that no claims have been narrowed within the meaning of *Festo*.

**I. Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance**

If, for any reason the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP §707.07(j) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

**II. Rejection of Claims 33-50 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter**

Claims 33-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Courter (Mastering MS Office 2000). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Examiner shows how Courter teaches a hyperlink tool having a first user interface (UI) used for the purpose of a user initiating construction of a hyperlink. Examiner further shows how Courter teaches a conventional spell check tool used for the different and separate purpose of indicating to a user a spelling error and providing a separate second user interface to the user (separate from first UI/hyperlink tool) for the purpose of enabling such user to correct such error.

The problem is that both of these separate tools have been designed for separate purposes and the user interface of each tool can not cooperate with each other or be displayed at the same time. Only one interface can be used at a time and for different purposes. The interfaces have no communication with each other nor work in concert to accomplish a unified broader purpose.

In Applicant phone interview with Examiner on December 9, 2004, Examiner states that when an error is detected from spell check tool (e.g., error is redlined or other visual indicator), a user can then initiate hyperlink tool upon said error and gain ability to create a hyperlink and/or change hyperlink label and thereby correct the error hence obviating Applicant Claims.

Though Examiner suggests that the user can initiate interaction with only the hyperlink tool user interface to conceivably make a link and/or correct spelling, there are several deficiencies with this method of accomplishing a result. First, the burden is on the user to initiate the action of using the hyperlink tool. Second, when the user does access the hyperlink tool, the user can not gain the benefits

of the conventional spell check tool such as options to change or ignore spelling or incorporate alternative spellings from a list leaving the user without help and left alone when trying to manually correct error through the hyperlink interface. The fact is that the hyperlink tool is a poor choice to the user because it provides no assistance in correcting the error defeating the purpose of a conventional spell check tool.

Using a hyperlink tool to make a hyperlink is known and obvious. However, adapting other tools (such as an enhanced spell check interface) for additional purposes of making a hyperlink from a spelling error is not. Applicant teaches a different method of performing such tasks. The problem is that the link tool in word processor can not be used or accessed when a spell check user interface is displayed. This is a burden to a user to have to deal with two separate interfaces to perform separate unrelated functions. Applicant teaches that spell check type interface can be used for a different purpose other than that of correcting a spelling error.

When the spell check feature is running, a conventional spell check user interface automatically displays for each error it encounters. Applicant teaches that instead of correcting the error, the existing error can instead serve as new use by being hyperlinked. Applicant teaches how an enhanced spell check interface having in addition to all conventional known features also further includes hyperlink tool capabilities built in to the same single user interface. By doing so, the burden of user initiating access to the interface is removed because the conventional spell check interfaces are configured to display in response to each discovered error.

#### **Amended Independent Claim 33 and Claim 42**

Additional limitations have been added to claims, "starting a spell check type program for evaluating said one or more words" and "said spell check type program automatically displaying an enhanced spell check type user interface, said user interface providing a user an ability to correct said word", and "said user interface further providing said user an ability to construct a hyperlink including said error in response" to determining that said word includes said error.

Such limitations more clearly show interconnection of elements and steps. This is very specific with regard to spell check interface and conditions of when an enhanced user interface is automatically displayed in response to error detection removing burden of user from taking an extra step of initiating manual use of a separate hyperlink tool.

#### **Amended Dependent Claim 38 and Claim 46**

Though Examiner addresses these claims with respect to a punctuation period symbol,

Examiner does not explain how Courter may read on fictitious domain names (FDN). Applicant teaches how FDN labels relate to hyperlink references. This provides yet one more reason why there is a need for an enhanced spell check tool. Claims have been amended to more distinctly show relationship of FDN as a spelling error and how to process it through enhanced interface. Limitations have been added to claims, "and said user interface further providing said user an ability to construct said label from said FDN and construct said hyperlink reference including a resolvable domain name corresponding to said network resource, said resolvable domain name including at least a portion of said FDN".

#### **Amended Dependent Claim 40 and Claim 48**

Examiner does not explain how Courter specifically reads on a hyperlink reference method and hyperlink label method. Current hyperlink tools require user to manually enter a label and point to a URL for a reference. Though once these parameters are manually set the hyperlink tool can automatically generate the hyper link, however these tools don't allow selecting a automatic generation method based on type for label and reference components of hyperlink. Applicant has removed "hyperlink generation operation" from claims to more specifically recite on a user selecting an automated label or reference method of construction.

#### **New Claims 51-55**

These claims recite aspects of the invention that are similar to dependent Claims 40 and 48. The important relationship of elements is allowing a user select a type of a hyperlink label to automatically generate from a UI tool where the label type corresponds to a hyperlink label method. For instance, one step in Claim 51 "automatically generating said hyperlink label and said hyperlink reference from said hyperlink label method corresponding to said selected hyperlink label type" recites the relationship among elements. Selecting a method of label or reference generation is important and not found in Courter are current hyperlink tools on the market.

All claims have been rewritten to define patentably over Courter and other references, alone or in combination.

### **III. Notice of References Cited, PTO-892**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the references cited but not applied. Applicant respectfully submits that none of those references, alone or in any combination, remedy the deficiencies of the applied art, nor teach or suggest the claimed invention alone or in any combination.

#### IV. Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the present application and pending claims 33-38, 40-46, 48-49, and 51-55, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a formal Notice of Allowance directed to claims 33-38, 40-46, 48-49, and 51-55, inclusive.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



December 24, 2004

---

Eric Schneider  
*pro se* Applicant

13938A Cedar Road #258  
University Heights, Ohio 44118  
(216) 231-2400 - telephone